

United States Patent and Trademark Office

W

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/910,914	07/24/2001	Kie Y. Ahn	M4065.0461/P461	2806
24998	7590 11/29/2004	EXAMINER		INER
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			FOURSON III, GEORGE R	
2101 L Street, NW Washington, DC 20037		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/910,914	AHN ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	George Fourson	2823				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exten 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment				
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
	The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
<u> </u>	☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:		$\frac{1}{2} \int \left(\int d^{2} d^{2} d^{2} d^{2} \right) d^{2} d^{2$				

George Hourson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2823

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's statement in the paragraph bridging pages 12 and 13 that none of the references relied on in combination is refuted by the statement of the rejections under 35 USC 103 in the office action mailed 8/26/04 contain the argument that the invention of the instant claims, including the named limitations, are suggested by the combination of references relied on. Applicant does not point to a particular limitation missing from all of the references but instead argues the references individually as not containing combinations of recited limitations. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In response to applicant's argument regarding use of the term "scope". The term scope is synonymous with "obvious" in this context.

Applicant argues that the references relied on address different problems and provide different advantages. However, this does not negate the teachings relied on. Furthermore, if this is an argument that the references are not analogous, all references relied on are directed to formation of Cu conductive layers in damascene processes and are therefor analogous.

Applicant's remaining arguments are arguments against the references individually and are addressed as in the first paragraph above.